REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending and claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 11, 14-16, 18-19 and 21-30 stand rejected. Claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 21 are amended. No new matter is added.

The Examiner and Applicants' attorney discussed the rejections in a telephone interview on June 10, 2009. The amendments to the claims presented here are based on that conversation and the Examiner's input, and the Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection in view of the amendments.

The Examiner rejected claims 15, 16, 18, 19 28-30 under 35 USC §112, ¶ 2. Claim 15 as amended describes a system for compressing image or audio data streams using a computer with a processor, and the system includes a dynamic predictor module, an adaptive Golomb engine, and a stream output device. The recited system components are structural elements as described in the specification, for example at paragraph [0043]. The rejection of claim 15 and its dependent claims should therefore be withdrawn. In addition, claim 19 is amended to correct a typographical error in its dependency, which resolves the antecedent basis rejection.

Independent claim 21, as amended, recites allowable subject matter (e.g., image data) as recited in claim 9. Further, claim 21 recites a receiving means, a dynamic predicting means, a Golomb coding means and an outputting means, each of which is configured to perform its respective operations (Specification, ¶[0014]). For example, a receiving means such as the Pre-Processing Engine 102 receives the uncompressed image or audio data and preprocesses the uncompressed image or audio data (Specification, ¶¶[0014]-[0015]). Dependent claims 22-20

8

depend from their base claims and also distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 21-30 under 35 USC §101 as not falling in with the four statutory categories of invention. As amended, each of the independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 21 recites allowable subject matter (e.g., image data) as recited in claim 9. Further, as amended, each independent claim recites a statutory subject matter, such as a computer processor. Therefore, independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 21 are statutory. Dependent claims, 2, 4-5, 7, 11, 14 and 22-30 depend from their base claims and are also statutory.

The Examiner is also asked to rejoin the withdrawn claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, and 20 upon a determination that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable in compliance with MPEP 821.04(a).

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned agent at the telephone number provided below.

                                        Respectfully submitted,
                                        RICHARD EUGENE CRANDALL, ET AL.

Dated: July 2, 2009   By: /Fengling Li/
                                        Fengling Li, Reg. No. 62,962
                                        Patent Agent
                                        Fenwick & West LLP
                                        Silicon Valley Center
                                        801 California Street
                                        Mountain View, CA 94041
                                        Tel. (650) 335-7182
                                        Fax (650) 938-5200